

**I. REMARKS**

The Office Action dated December 4, 2007, has been received and carefully noted. The amendments made herein and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-10 and 12-20 are pending.

No amendments to the claims or specification are made at this time.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Visca et al. (EP 1006168). Applicants traverse the rejection.

Applicants note that the technical problem of the presently claimed invention is to obtain coatings on metal substrata having anticorrosive properties.

The differences between the presently claimed invention and Visca et al. have been discussed previously. For example, Applicants resubmit that the compound of formula (I) and (II) of Visca et al. are not the compound of formula (C) and (D) of claim 10. Further, as noted by the Examiner, "Visca fails to explicitly disclose a compound that is within the genus claimed" (Office Action, page 4). In addition, Applicants submit that Visca et al. does not teach or suggest the second step of claim 10 of the presently claimed invention, which is "performing a thermal treatment of the metal substrates and their alloys at a temperature in the range of 60°C to 250°C."

Further, as discussed previously, Applicants submit that Visca et al. does not teach or suggest how to achieve a compound that can be used to confer "anti-corrosive properties to metal substrata" (claim 10).

For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that Visca et al. does not teach or suggest each and every element of the presently claimed invention. As such,

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 under 25 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Visca et al.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Visca et al., alone or in view of Kestner et al. (U.S. Patent No.4,125,152). Applicants traverse the rejection.

Applicants submit that based on the statements in paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner seems to be indicating that one of skill in the art would have applied the (per)fluoropolyether (PFPE) derivatives disclosed in Visca et al. (for example, PFPE phosphates) to coat metallic substrata. Applicants submit that in this way, however, metal surfaces would not be protected from corrosion, as is shown in Table 2 on page 31 of the specification, wherein the results of a corrosion test carried out on copper plates coated respectively with PFPE phosphates and with silane-terminated compounds of present claim 10, are reported. The test is described on page 16 of the specification, and the results that are obtained are measured according to ASTM Copper Strip Corrosion Standards (ASTM method D130/IP154) (see page 17, lines 1-3).

In Table 2, Examples 11 and 12 are directed to copper plates coated, respectively, with a solution 1% and 5% by weight of the mixture of PFPE silanes having of monofunctional structure (C) and bifunctional structure (D) in a weight ratio of 3/1 (see page 26 lines 7-8). Examples 13 and 14 are directed to copper plates coated, respectively, with a solution of 1% and 5% by weight of the PFPE bifunctional phosphate of structure (B). The specification notes that the copper samples used in Examples 11-14 were dipped for 10 minutes into each of the respective solutions. After

said treatment, the copper plates were recovered and submitted to a heating step, as indicated in the specification on page 26, lines 19-20, and on page 28, lines 22-23.

Table 2 of the specification shows that by using compositions of Example 11 and of Example 13 for coating the copper plates, the following results were seen after one month from the start of the anti-corrosion test:

- The copper plates treated with the mixtures of monofunctional and bifunctional PFPE silane were scored 2a, which means moderate corrosion (Example 11).
- The copper plates treated with the bifunctional PFPE phosphate were scored 3b, which means strong corrosion (Example 13).

Table 2 also shows that by using the compositions of Example 12 and of Example 14, both having a content of 5% of the respective anti-corrosion agent, the following results were seen after one month from the start of the anti-corrosion test:

- The copper plates treated with the mixtures of monofunctional and bifunctional PFPE silane were scored 1a, that means light corrosion (Example 12).
- The copper plates treated with the bifunctional PFPE phosphate were again scored 3b and therefore were strongly corroded (Example 13).

Applicants submit that this shows that the PFPE phosphates disclosed in Visca et al. do not solve the problem of protecting metals from corrosion and that a coating obtained by using the PFPE silanes reduces metal corrosion. Applicants submit that said finding is non-obvious over Visca et al., because Visca et al. does not teach or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to use PFPE silanes for coating metals. Applicants note that Visca et al. does not exemplify PFPE silane compounds.

Applicants submit that Kestner et al. does not cure the deficiencies of Visca et al. Applicants submit that Kestner et al. fails to teach or suggest using PFPE silanes as coating agents for reducing or protecting metals from corrosion.


For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that Visca et al., alone or in combination with Kestner et al. fails to teach or suggest the presently claimed invention. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Visca et al. and Kestner et al.

## II. CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event this response is not timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension, along with any other additional fees which may be required with respect to this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing Attorney Docket No. 108910-00051.

Respectfully submitted,



Yelee Kim  
Registration No. 60,088

Customer No. 004372  
ARENT FOX LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Tel: (202) 857-6000  
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RJB/YYK/mlh